

1 John M. Farrell (CA Bar No. #99649)  
farrell@fr.com  
2 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
3 Redwood City, CA 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
4 Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

5 Jonathan E. Singer (CA Bar No. #187908)  
singer@fr.com  
6 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
3200 RBC Plaza  
7 60 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
8 Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

9 Juanita R. Brooks (CA Bar No. #75934)  
brooks@fr.com  
10 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
12390 El Camino Real  
11 San Diego, CA 92130  
12 Telephone: (858) 678-5070  
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
14 GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.

15 *Additional counsel listed on signature page*

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**(SAN JOSE DIVISION)**

18 GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,

19 Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,

20 v.

21 MERCK & CO, INC. (Defendant only), MERCK  
SHARP & DOHME CORP. and ISIS  
22 PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

23 Defendants and Counterclaimants.

Case No. 5:13-cv-04057-BLF/PSG

**GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.'S BRIEF  
REGARDING USE OF MR. CARTER'S  
EXPERT REPORT FROM THE IDENIX  
ACTION**

Gilead disclosed its intention to use the expert report of Mr. Andrew Carter from the parallel Idenix action (“Idenix Report”) to cross-examine Mr. Carter in the present action. Merck objected on the grounds that Gilead’s disclosure is irrelevant to Mr. Carter’s opinion in this case. Gilead is entitled to fully cross-examine Mr. Carter on the bases for his opinions. In his Report in this action, Mr. Carter calculated the reasonable royalty on the *entire* U.S. net sales of Sovaldi and Harvoni because the ’499 and ’712 patents “cover the active metabolite that is responsible for the therapeutic benefit of sofosbuvir for treating HCV infection and methods of treatment that provide that metabolite,” using an Entire Market Value Rule theory. (ECF No. 230-12 (“Carter Rept.”), §§ 6.3, 13.3.) In his Idenix Report, however, Mr. Carter made nearly identical statements regarding the Idenix patents at issue in that case—*i.e.*, the *Idenix patents* are “responsible for the therapeutic benefit of sofosbuvir for treating HCV infection.” (See Table 1.) In other words, Mr. Carter has taken the inconsistent position that two distinct sets of patents both establish the basis for customer demand for sofosbuvir, and both justify the application of the Entire Market Value Rule for calculating damages for sofosbuvir. This seemingly irreconcilable inconsistency goes directly to Mr. Carter’s credibility and his methodology, and Gilead is entitled to present this inconsistency on cross-examination.

Table 1	
Mr. Carter’s Merck Report (§ 6.3)	Mr. Carter’s Idenix Report (§ 6.4)
Based on discussions with Dr. Benet, I understand that the compounds claimed in the ’712 patent include metabolites that are formed when sofosbuvir is taken by a patient, including the active metabolite that is responsible for the therapeutic benefit of sofosbuvir for treating HCV infection. Based on these discussions, I further understand that the methods claimed in the ’499 patent include methods for treating HCV infection by providing a prodrug, like sofosbuvir, that forms metabolites described by the formula in claim 1 of that patent, including the active metabolite that is responsible for the therapeutic benefit of sofosbuvir for treating HCV infection.	Based on discussions with Dr. Meier and Dr. Glenn, I understand that the compounds claimed by the Patents-in-Suit include metabolites that are formed when sofosbuvir is taken by a patient, including the active metabolite that is responsible for the therapeutic benefit of sofosbuvir for treating HCV infection. Based on these discussions, I further understand that the methods claimed by the Patents-in-Suit include methods for treating HCV infection by providing a prodrug, like sofosbuvir, that forms metabolites, including the active metabolite that is responsible for the therapeutic benefit of sofosbuvir.

1 Gilead respectfully requests that the Court permit the use of Mr. Carter's Idenix Report  
2 on cross-examination.

3  
4 Dated: March 20, 2016

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

5 By: /s/ Joseph B. Warden

6 Joseph B. Warden

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.

8  
9 *Additional counsel:*

10 Douglas E. McCann (*Pro Hac Vice*)

11 dmccann@fr.com

Gregory R. Booker (*Pro Hac Vice*)

12 booker@fr.com

Robert M. Oakes (*Pro Hac Vice*)

13 oakes@fr.com

Elizabeth Flanagan (*Pro Hac Vice*)

14 eflanagan@fr.com

Joseph B. Warden (*Pro Hac Vice*)

15 warden@fr.com

16 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

222 Delaware Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor

17 Wilmington, DE 19801

18 Telephone: (302) 652-5070

Facsimile: (302) 652-0607